

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with Applicants' representatives on September 23, 2004, and for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated June 2, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 9 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based upon the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,883, issued to Yamada et al. (hereinafter "Yamada"), U.S. Patent No. 5,844,643, issued to Onishi et al. (hereinafter "Onishi"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,256,080, issued to Colgan et al. (hereinafter "Colgan").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Yamada, Onishi nor Colgan, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Yamada, Onishi and Colgan fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device in which "the first and second dielectric frames are located exclusively in regions other than where the pixel region is formed" as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Because Yamada, Onishi and Colgan fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Colgan.

Yamada, Onishi and Colgan also fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device in which "the first and second dielectric protrusions are located exclusively in regions other than where the divided pixel regions are formed" as recited in independent claim 9. Because Yamada, Onishi and Colgan fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 9, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-19 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Colgan.

Yamada, Onishi and Colgan further fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device having an array of pixels “wherein the first and second insulating protrusions are located exclusively in regions other than where the pixel is formed” as recited in independent claim 20 of the present application. Because Yamada, Onishi and Colgan fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 20, claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-37 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Colgan.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-37 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-37 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada, Onishi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,728, issued to Kondo et al. (hereafter “Kondo”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Yamada, Onishi nor Kondo, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Kondo fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Yamada and Onishi such that a combination of the teachings of Yamada, Onishi and Kondo would provide a multi-domain liquid crystal display device in which “the first and second dielectric frames are located exclusively in regions other than where the pixel region is formed” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Because Yamada, Onishi and Kondo fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Kondo.

Yamada, Onishi and Kondo, analyzed alone or in any combination, also fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device “wherein the first and second dielectric protrusions are located exclusively in regions other than where the divided pixel regions are formed” as recited in independent claim 9. Because Yamada, Onishi and Kondo fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 9, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-19 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Kondo.

Yamada, Onishi and Kondo, analyzed alone or in any combination, further fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device in which “the first and second insulating protrusions are located exclusively in regions other than where the pixel is formed” as recited in

independent claim 20. Because Yamada, Onishi and Kondo fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 20, claim 20 and its dependent claims 20-37 are allowable over any combination of Yamada, Onishi and Kondo.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-37 are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant